App F.IX-4

1925.

File No. 130-25

Previous References
Mug 302-23-1-2 (Mugrac)

Serial Nos. 1--8

Later references.
Mug 39-28-1-8

(30)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 8

Part B for May 1926

SUBJECT

Petition from K Appanna, Agent of Megal & Re Lagina Mutts, Bangalore city, appealing against the order of the Mug. Comr declining the resumption of certain lands in Kottanur Village for the benefit of the Institution.

DR 1503 dated 25-5-1926 To the Petitioner

-Govt. see no grounds to interfere with the case. His appeal is rejected.

G. R S. 11] 1925

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inwards

NOTES.

File No. 130
1925.

FILE HEADING.

Megal and Kelagina Matts near Sunkenahalli, Bangalore city.

From

Kaspanna, Agent and Manager.

No. Petition Dated 3/11/25. Received

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.
548	2	—	1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the Inwz. Comr's. order declining the Resumption under cls. Comr's. Notification of 1877, of certain lands in Kotha & new Village, Bangalore Taluk, for the benefit of the said inams.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1 The Petition is duly stamped.

The Inwz. Comr's. order of 21.8.25 communicating the order appealed against has been produced.

The appeal is in time.

NOTES—First Sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No 130 of 1925

Serial No

3 A Off. calling for report with records, & Submitted for appl on merits.

AL
24.11.25

4 The facts of the Case are clear from the appeal petition. Fully assessed lands belonging to Hindus and Bari have been alienated long ago. The appellant wants that this should be restored to temple. The Asst Coll has come to the finding that he cannot do it either under the Chief Court's Notn of 1877 or under Sec 10 of the Rent Regn. The Asst Coll's order is correct. The appeal may perhaps be rejected.

26.11.25.

Rev Secy)

5 In view of the Statements in para 11 of the petition, the records may perhaps be called for and perused.

(1st member)

4.12.25.

138
5.12

6 Yes. Records may be called for. Sgd

7.12.25.

7.11.25

PV
5/12

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 130 of 192 5.

Serial No

1 Dft. submitted.
AS 8.12.25 8/12 8/12/25
8 June
8/12/25

2 To the Mines Comr. No. 725 dt. 12-12-25
Forwards the above appeal petn. for
report with records

Sen 23/12 3. From, the Inspr. Comr.
Letter no C. 685 dt. 16.2.1926.
Submits the report with
records called for in Sl. 2.
With reference to paras 5 & 6 of the office-note, it is submitted that ~~that~~ the appt complains in para 11 of the ~~office-note~~ petition that the Dy. Comr cancelled the order of his predecessor without any enquiry etc.
In para 11 of his appeal petition to the Mysore Comr, he has made a similar allegation. The office-note of the Mines Comr's Office (C) deals with this point. It is seen from the records that under the Mines Comr's order dt 14th May 1925, the Dy. Comr cancelled his predecessor's order, and not on his own authority as alleged.
11 Submitted for
V/25 2/26

Note—Contn. Sheet

App. F. III—2]

WD 0569—GPB—40,000—31-7-25

File No. of 192 .

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.	

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 12/11 of 192

Serial No

12

1) Vide kind refee :- paras (4), (5) & (6).

2) Kind refee is invited to the mez. Comm's office note ( ) (C) on this case.

3) Re the allegation in Para 11 of the petition :- It is seen that, it was under the orders of the Mez. Commr. that the D.C cancelled the orders of his predecessor. (vide) (R). The allegation of the petr. is not therefore correct.

4) The mez. comm's order, declining the resumption seems correct. The appeal may be rejected.

Rec. sd/ 4/3

13 The office shd note on the result of the civil suit - referred to (R)

4/3. 4/3

14 No information is available. D/R. enquiring from Mr:-

AV 3-3-1926. 15 The suit was filed in the Bangalore munciph' court by Channamma and 20 others for a declaration of their title to the lands in Kothanur Village which were ordered to be resumed by the Dy. Commr. for the benefit of the math in question. A perusal of this order must have given relief to petrs. & after

AV 3/3/26. 3/3/26

(Vide copy of the Plaint T. No. 302-23) D

Please bring up. 4/3

HR. (HC: Cover portion). 4/3

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

App. F. III—2]

WD 0569—GPB—40,000—31-7-25

File No. of 192 .

General and Reverse Secretariat

Serial No.	

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No

the D.Cs order of resumption, the suit was filed by Channamma & 2 ors, against Kaffanna (the present appellant) & the D.C. Bangalore, for a declaration of their title to the lands and for an injunction restraining the defendants from interfering with the plaintiffs peaceful possn & enjoyment. (H.C.P).

17 Therefore, the cancellation of the D.C's order of resumption was ordered, (H.A). The suit must have been taken back. The exact result of the suit is not in the record. A draft ~~letter~~ covering is put up for approval.

19 Rev. Secy) 6/3

20 h 6/3 Issue 6/3

4 To the Mun Comm
No 1140 dt 8.3.26
Requests him to ascertain & report the result of the Civil Suit filed by Channamma & two others in the B'lore Munsiff's court against the Agent of the matt & the D.C.

5. From the Mun. Comr
Letter no. 685 dt 3.4.26
Reports that the civil Suit O.S. 621 of 23-24 filed by Channamma and 2 others

Note—Contn. Sheet

App. F. III—2]

WD 0569—GPB—40,000—31-7-25

File No. of 192 .

General and Reven Secretariat

Serial No.	

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No

against the Agent of the Nait States posted to 8th June 1926 for evidence.

To Submit. [illegible] with ref. to the Secretary's order in para 13 of the office note. The result of the suit may be awaited.

AV 8/4/26. I The file of papers of the Insp. Comm's office containing his office-note and the order appealed against, has not been received. May the file be called for? I

RK 9.4.26

Rev. Sec'y 25-A-4-26

9/4

AV 8/9/4

AV 14/4

To D/D. Submit

AV 15.4.26 RK 15/4/26 27 Issue 15/4

6 To, Insp Comm No 1330 dt 19.4.26 Calls for the file of papers containing his office note & the order appealed against

7. From, the Insp. Comm Letter no. C. 685 dt 23.4.26. Submits his office file containing the office note and the order appealed against.

28 Submit. for orders. Upon it [illegible]

AV 28.4.26

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01264—GPB—40,000 -17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No 130 of 1925

Serial No

The undersigned notes of 1-3-26 above.

28/4/26 Rev. Secy 29/4

I see from the Ver: records that the matter had come up before Govt: in appeal in 1923, when the order of Mr. Narayana Iyengar of 25-1-25 was challenged.

As per instructions conveyed by the Hon'ble Minister in his letter of 14th May 1924, the order of attachment has been cancelled, & the parties allowed rights as they respectively had in the civil court.

The Govt: records connected with P should be handed over to Mysore with a note.

1-5-26

Mysore F. no. 302-23 on the Subject is submitted. It will be seen from the correction that Channamma and others of Bangalore appealed against the Bangalore Dy. Comr's. order, resuming certain lands in Kotnur Village, said to belong to Guru Siddappa Devaru mate at Sunkenahalli in the Bangalore Taluk. The appellants filed a civil suit in the

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 130 of 192

Serial No.

1st Munsiff Court, Bangalore, applies, Kappanna, Agent of the Mall and the Dy Comr, Bangalore, contending that the civil properties which were resumed under Dy. Comr's. order do not belong to any muzrai institn. The Muz. Comr recommended that the better plan was to cancel Mr Narsingarao's order which was passed under a misapprehension and leave the parties to contest their rights in the civil court This was sanctioned in S.O. no. 227/Muz. 302-25 dy 18. 8. 24.

Submn. for orders.

11/8.5.26 Rep[t]:- Paras 30-32 above.

8/5/26 Rev. decl) 8/5

34) The appeal may be rejected.

1st. member) 10.5.26. 11/5

35) Accdg. orders may be issued accordingly.

10.5.26

19/5

36) Dft. submn. 15.5.26. 19/5/26 37) Issue 19/5

29/2 11.5.26.

140/18.5

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01264—GPB—40,000—17-12-25

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mer. File No. 130 of 1925.

Serial No. 8

To The Agent of the Sunkenahalli Mats
No 1503 dt 25.5.26
Rejects the appeal
~~appl~~ for reasons given
No 1504 dt 25.5.26. Forwards
Copy of the above

NOTE—Contn. Sheet



mur 130-25-1

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muzrai Appeal No. of 1925-26.

***

Presented by H. K Narasimha
aor for the appellant.
Asst. Mgr
h
3/4/25

APPELLANT:- Kappanna, Agent & Manager
of Megala Mutt & Kelagala Mutt,
near Sunkenahally,
8th Division,
BANGALORE CITY.

---:*:*:*:*:*:---

UNDER SECTIONS 21 AND 22 OF THE MUZRAI REGULATION

The appellant above named respectfully - begs to state as follows:-

1. There are, from a very long time, near Sunkenahally, 8th Division, Bangalore, - two Lingayat Mutts - called the Megala (Upper) Mutt and the Kelagala (Lower) Mutt. They are generally known as Sunkenahally Jangam Mutts, as they belong exclusively to Jangama or Lingayet Community. And latterly, that is from - the time of one Gurusidda Devaru - one of the Swamies in the said Mutts - these Mutts were - sometimes called after his name as he was very popular and as during his time the Mutts -- attained their height of prosperity; and after his

his demise he was buried in the precincts of the Mutt, and his Gaddige is still an object of worship among his devotees.

2. The said Mutts are Muzrai Institutions and own lands - both Inam and Assessed - near Yediyur, Nagasandra, Vaddarahally, and Sunkenahally Villages in Bangalore Taluk, and the lands were leased out to the tenants who were cultivating them rendering produce to the Mutt. And some of the Inam lands having been acquired for developing the Basavanagudi and Gavipuram Extensions, the Government were pleased to grant, out of the compensation amount, a few acres of land for the Mutts near Dodda Togur Village and the balance of the compensation amount is still in deposit in the Savings Bank and in the District Judge's Court, Bangalore.

3. That, some time after the death of Gurusidda Devaru, the affairs of the Mutt were in a chaotic condition, and some of the unscrupulous tenants, who were then cultivating the Mutt lands, took advantage of this disorder and began fraudulently to appropriate the produce for themselves and alienate these lands.

4. These fraudulent alienations, however, continued undiscovered till about the year

year 1920, when the Appellant, who is now managing the affairs of the Mutts, discovered that some of the lands, namely Survey Nos. 20/3, 28/2, 30/3 and 35/3, standing in the Khata of Gurusidda Devaru in Vaddarahally Village near Kottanur in Bangalore Taluk, were in the cultivation of persons who had no ostensible claim to these lands and the alienation in whose favour had been made fraudulently by the tenants of the Mutt without the knowledge or consent of the Swamies.

5. The Appellants immediately brought this to the notice of the Amildar of Bangalore Taluk, by a petition, and prayed that the matter might kindly be inquired into and the lands be resumed to the Mutts, or, if the alienations were found valid, the said lands be acquired for the Mutt out of the compensation amount in deposit in the Savings Bank.

6. The Amildar sent for these persons in cultivation. And only Chennamma, Kullappa and Hanumakka, who cultivate lands Survey Nos. 20/3, 28/2 & 30/3, appeared before him, and said that they had purchased these lands from one Chickka Thimmiah, the Patel of the neighbouring Village of Kembathahalli, and that he alone could explain how he himself got possession of these lands. But the said Chickka - Thimmiah, who also cultivates the other Survey No. - 35/3, in spite of notice refused to appear before - the Amildar and furnish any explanation as to how he happened to be in possession of these lands or under what authority he sold these lands to the aforesaid -

Kullappa

Kullappa, Hanumakka and others.

7. Thereupon, the Amildar, after examining their Title Deeds and all the records connected with these lands, and after recording the statements of the aforesaid Chennamma, Kullappa and Hanumakka and the statements of the Appellant and the Village Shanbhogue, found that these lands originally belonged to the Mutt and the Ryots, who cultivated them, had, in collusion with the Shanbhogue and the Patel of the Village, fraudulently alienated them and got up some fictitious Sale - Deeds and submitted his report to the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore for orders.

8. The then Deputy Commissioner, after a careful examination of all the records connected with these lands, found that these lands belonged to the Mutts and that the Mutts were Muzrai Institutions and that the lands had been alienated - fraudulently, and passed an Order No. D. C. 4166/ 20-21 dated 25-5-1921, directing that the lands be resumed to the Mutt after giving 6 months' Notice to the persons in possession of these lands.

9. That against this Order of the Deputy Commissioner, the said persons in possession of these lands, namely, Chennamma, Kulleppa and Hanumakka, preferred an appeal before the Muzrai Commissioner, but their appeal was thrown out as having been time-barred, and the order of the Deputy Commissioner was confirmed.

10. But

10. But, as the said Chennamma, Kulleppa and Hanumakka failed to deliver possession of these lands to the Mutts, as directed by the Deputy Commissioner, the Order was executed, and the 5 years' produce of these lands was sold by auction.

11. But, three years after the Deputy Commissioner's order referred to above, the learned Deputy Commissioner, who is now in office, suo motto and without any fresh enquiry or giving any Notice to the Appellant, and without any application by the aggrieved parties, cancelled the order of his predecessor in office, and issued an Endorsement/ to the Appellant No. P.1317/23-24 dated 20-5-1924, to the effect that the Order passed by his predecessor in office No. D.C.4166/ 20-21, dated 25-5-1921, had been cancelled as the said order had been passed on the assumption that these - lands were Inam lands, but on subsequent correspondence with the Muzrai Commissioner, the said lands were found to be assessed lands.

12. It is respectfully submitted that the order of the learned Deputy Commissioner is opposed to Law, and is otherwise without jurisdiction in so far as it seeks to review and cancel an order passed by his predecessor in office, three years after its date and after it had been confirmed by the Appellate authority and after it had been executed. And further the - grounds on which he bases his order are neither valid nor sufficient.

13. The Appellant, therefore, preferred an - appeal before the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Banga-

lore

Bangalore, praying for the cancellation of this Order No. P. 1317/23-24, dated 20-5-1924, and for the restoration of the previous order No. D.C. - 4166/20-21 dated 25-5-1921. But, one year after the date of the Appellant's appeal, the Learned Muzrai Commissioner, without even hearing the Appellant, issues an Endorsement to the Appellant - filed herewith, No. A. P. 10 of 1925-26, dated 20/21st August 1925, informing him that his appeal - had been dismissed on the grounds that the lands in question not being Inam lands, they cannot be resumed under Chief Commissioner's Notification of 1877, and that the alleged alienations having taken place long ago, and no application having been made within time, no action could be taken under Section 10 of the Muzrai Regulation. Hence the present appeal before this Hon'ble Court.

14. It is respectfully submitted that both the Lower Courts have failed to understand the scope of the enquiry which led to the order passed by Mr. M. A. Narayana Iyengar, the Learned - Deputy Commissioner, and have thrown out the appeal on mere technical grounds.

15. In so far as the alienations were fraudulent and unauthorised, the order was applicable irrespective of the fact whether they were Inam lands or assessed lands, so long as they happened to be Mutt lands and had been wrongly alienated.

16. In cases of fraudulent alienations,

the

the operation of Section 10 of the Muzrai Regulation will have to be construed liberally. The Appellant having made his application within three years from the date on which he discovered the fraud, his application was fully within time.

17. Besides, since the alienations had taken place within 8 years from the date of the Appellant's application, the earliest Sale Deed being dated 19-9-1912, there was no question of the alienee's possession having ripened into ownership by adverse possession of 12 years, and the order of resumption was perfectly justified.

18. Further, both the Lower Courts have lost sight of the two-fold prayer made by the Appellant, namely, that the lands having originally belonged to the Mutt, be either resumed for the Mutt or if the alienations were found to be valid, they might be acquired for the Mutt, out of the compensation amount now in deposit with the Government.

WHEREFORE, the Appellant respectfully prays that the orders of ~~the~~ both the Lower Courts be reversed, and the Order of the Learned Deputy Commissioner No. D. C. 4166/20-21 dated 25-5-1921, be kindly restored; or, this Hon'ble Court might, after enquiry, be graciously pleased to pass such orders regarding acquisition of these lands for the Mutt, or otherwise, as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the circumstances of the case.

BANGALORE,
3rd. November, 1925.

K.N. Srinivasan.
ADVOCATE FOR THE APPELLANT.

No. A·P·10 g 25 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore, 20th August 1925.

Endorsement.

In reply to ~~your~~ his appeal petition dated 20th August 1924 requesting to set aside the Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner's order withdrawing the order of resumption of S.Nos.20/3, 28/3, 30/3 and 35/3 in Kothnur village in the Bangalore Taluk said to belong to Sunkenahalli Jangam Matt, Kappanna, Agent of Megala and Kelagala Matt at Sunkenahalli, Bangalore Taluk, is informed that from a perusal of the records connected with the case and received from the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District it is seen that the lands in question are not inam lands and as such they cannot be resumed under Chief Commissioner's Notification of 1877.

Since the alienation is alleged to have taken place long ago and as no application was made to the authorities in time action cannot be taken under Sec.10 of the Muzrai Regulation.

For these reasons the appeal is dismissed.

for Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.



Before the Government of H.H. The Maharajah of Mysore ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

192 —2 ನೇ ನಂಬರು
Muzrai Appeal No. of 1925-26

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜೀದಾರ್
Appellant

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್

Kappanna vs.

ಮು|| ರಾ|| ಕೆ. ಎನ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ, ಎಂ. ಎ., ಎಲ್. ಎಲ್. ಬಿ., ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್‌ರಿಗೆ:—

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ವರವಾಗಿ ಆಫೀರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸುವದಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾವ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ರಾಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಪ್ರೆಸಲ್ಯಾಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೊರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿಹುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾವಸು ವಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ನಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಂಡಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

K.N. Srinivasan.
3/11/25.

ತಾರೀಖು 3-11-1925
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್.

A47 F.VI G1.]

B650

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the 192

Date of issue 12. 12. 25

Signed by. ..

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

Section "

File No. 'so 25

Serial No. 2

No. 735 S. 24 / 4, F.

To The Hnz. Chief

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for report with records petition no. 548 of 3.11.25 from Kappanna, Agent and manager of Hegalhe and Kelagina mats near Sunkenahalli, Bangalore city, appealing against the two years order declining the resumption under ch. Civil Notification of 1894, of certain lands in Kothanur Village

over

20

Bangalore Taluk, alleged
to belong to Megal and
Kelapura mats near
Sunkenahalli, Bangalore
City

I have etc.

8/12/25

Dy. Conservator

8.12.25

3[illegible] No. C 685 of 25-6 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.
Three files
Dated Bangalore, 15th February 1926.

From

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

To

B. Srinivasa Iyangar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.735/Muz.130-25-2 dated 12th December 1925 forwarding for report with records petition - from Pappanna Agent of Megala and Kelagina Matts near Sunkenahally appealing against this office order declining the resumption of - certain lands in Kothanur village Bangalore Taluk alleged to ---- belong to the aforesaid matts, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire file of records received with the Bangalore District -- Deputy Commissioner's letter No.C.3-79-26 dated 9th February 1926.

The Deputy Commissioner's letter of the 2nd July 1925 and the endorsement issued thereon to the appellant and in the enclosed R Dis.file No.43 of 25-26 of this office give the facts of the case.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for Muzrai Commissioner.
Absent on Casual leave

KSR.

APP. F. VI. Gl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Inw

File No. I 30-25

Seria No. 4

No. 1140

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

To The Inwd Cons & Cus

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

Date of issue 8/3/26

Signed by JWN

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no. C-685 dg 16-2-26 reporting on the appeal petition of Kappanna regarding the lands in Kothanur village, Bangalore Taluk, alleged to belong to Megala and Kelagina matts near Sunkenahalli, Bangalore Taluk, I am directed to request that you will be so good as to ascertain [illegible] at an early date

The result of the civil suit filed by Channamma and two others in the Bangalore Munsiffs' Court against the Agent of the said mill and the Dy. Comr., Bangalore, vide S.O. No. 227/Misc. 302-23 dt. 18th August 1924.

(2) The records are herewith returned for ref. & necessary action.

I have etc.

Sd/- Illegible
for Secretary.

6.3.26

24

No. 6850/28-26 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.
encl one + 1 file

Dated Bangalore, 1st April 1926.
3

From

P. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

GEN. & REV SEC. RECEIVED 5-APR 1926 PRINT. MUZRAI D 1154

Muz. 130-25-5.

GENL. & REV. SECTT. Br. Muz. 3 APR 1926 G. D. SECTION.

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.1140/Muz.130-25-4 dated 8th March 1926 requesting to report the result of the civil suit filed by Channamma and two others in the Bangalore Munsiff's Court against the Agent of the Megala and Nelagina matts near Sunkenahalli in the matter of the matt lands in Kothur village, Bangalore Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of the letter No.C.3-79-26 dated 27th March 1926 from the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District stating that the civil suit O.S.621 of 23-24 filed by Channamma and two others against the Agent of the aforesaid Matt stands posted to 8th June 1926 for evidence.

The records received from the Deputy Commissioner are resubmitted herewith.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

(absent on casual leave)

Letter No.C.3-79-26 dated 27th March 1926 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District to the Muzrai Commissioner in -- Mysore.

- - - -

"With reference to your letter No.C.685/25-26 dated 16th March 1926, regarding the lands in Kothanur village, Bangalore Taluk, -- alleged to belong to Megala and Kelagena matts near Sunkenahalli -- Bangalore Taluk, I have the honor to state that it is ascertained from the 1st Munsiff, Bangalore, that the Civil Suit (viz., O.S.621-1923-24) filed by Channamma and two others against the agent of the said matt is still pending. It stands posted to 8th June 1926 for evidence.

The records received with your letter under reply are resubmitted herewith."

"C o p y"

for Muzrai Commissioner.

APP F VI. Gl.

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section mer

File No. 130-25

Seria No. 6

Diary No. of letter replied to...

No. 1330

Ans 2 files

To The Insp. Cmr.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Sir,

Adverting to Correspondence ending with your letter No. 685 of 3rd April 1926 reporting that Civil Suit O.S. 621 of 23-4 filed by Channamma and two others against the Agent of the Moggala and Kolasane Matts near Sunkenahalli Bangalore, Stands posted to 8th June 1926 for evidence, I am directed to request

over

Date of issue 19/4/26

Signed by .....

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 056—GPB—31,000—17-8-25

So soon as to send up
for reference, the file
of papers of your office
containing the Vice-Note
and the ~~file of pa~~ under
appealed against.
(2) The records are
wanted for ref. & re-turn.
I have etc.

Dy. Secy. Revenue.

15/4/26

No. C 685 ⅞ 25-26 (...
and three files

...

44913

From

...

...

...

APP. F. VI. Gl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section mun

File No. 130·25

Seria No. 8

No. 150

To

.....

.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue 25/5/26

Signed by Asst. N.

With reference to his petition no. 548 dt 3-11-25 appealing against the D.C's order declining the resumption under ch. Govt's. Notification of 1847 of certain lands in Kothanur Village, Bangalore Taluk, alleged to belong to Inam and Kalagina matts at Sunkenahalli, Bangalore Taluk, Mr Kappanna, (Thro' Mr K. T. Sankaran, Adv. Agent and manager, to informed that Govt Dec

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD 0562—GPB—31,000—17-8-25

no grounds to interfere
with the order ~~appealed~~ of the Asst. Comm^r
~~against.~~ ~~His~~ appeal is
~~accordingly~~ rejected.

By order

Secretary,
Rev. Dept.

Copy of the Govt. Order No. 1504/Govt/25
with ref. to the correspondence
ending with his letter no.
C-685 dt 23.4.1923.

(2) The records are
herewith returned.

By order,

Secretary,
Rev. Dept.